



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/711,950

10/15/2004

Thomas Robieu

A92185

5949

30008 7590 11/03/2008
GUDRUN E. HUCKETT DRAUDT
SCHUBERTSTR. 15A
WUPPERTAL, 42289
GERMANY

EXAMINER

CHUKWURAH, NATHANIEL C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3721

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/03/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte: THOMAS ROBIEU AND JEAN-CLAUDE MARET

Application No. 10/711,950
Technology Center 3700

Mailed: November 3, 2008

Before KRISTA ZELE *Deputy Chief Appeals Administrator*
ZELE, *Deputy Chief Appeals Administrator*.

ORDER RETURNING UNDOCKETED APPEAL TO EXAMINER

This application was electronically received by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on June 9, 2008. A review of the application revealed that it is not ready for docketing as an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being returned to the Examiner to address the following matter(s) requiring attention prior to docketing.

APPEAL BRIEF, GROUNDS OF REJECTION

A review of the file finds that the grounds of rejection of the claims as provided in the Appeal Brief filed March 12, 2007, under the heading “Grounds Of Rejection To Be Reviewed On Appeal” is unclear and/or is not consistent with the grounds of rejection of claims of record. The grounds of rejection of the claims as provided in the Appeal Brief must be consistent with the last Office action of record, including any Advisory action responsive to any after final submissions. Each Grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal must be identified.

A review of the last Office action, including any mailed Advisory Action(s) finds that claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bidanset (US 3,982,616) in view of Shultz (US 5,503,261). Appellant(s) have not indicated the grounds of rejection of this claim. Correction of the Grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal for **all** claims is required.

APPEAL BRIEF, ARGUMENTS

A review of the file finds that the arguments with respect to each grounds of rejection as provided in the Appeal Brief filed March 12, 2007 and May 24, 2007, under the heading “Argument” have not been clearly provided. Each grounds of rejection must be treated under a **separate heading** in accordance with 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vii). Any claim argued separately should be placed under a subheading identifying the claim by number. Claims argued as a group should be placed under a subheading identifying the claims by number.

Appellant has not provided the necessary headings and/or subheadings for arguments which correspond to each grounds of rejection. *See also Manual of Patent Examining Procedure* (MPEP) § 1205.02 (8th ed. Rev. 6, Sept 2007) for details.

The rejection of claim 24 has not been argued.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the application is returned to the Examiner to:

- 1) to hold the Appeal Brief filed on March 12, 2007, defective;
- 2) notify Appellant to file a paper properly addressing the Grounds of Rejection of all claims and to address the arguments for each grounds of rejection as required;
- 3) for such further action as may be appropriate.

If there are any questions pertaining to this Order, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797.

KZ/dpv/dw

GUDRUN E. HUCKETT DRAUDT
SCHUBERTSTR. 15A
WUPPERTAL 42289 DE GERMANY